

When in Hakodadi Bay -  
in Simoodah

Heekui (an Iruud A)  
I cannot discover their ~~location~~ <sup>location</sup> in my map or Gazette  
as to the box in which

the slides are, it is one I got from  
London, and thank for sending them  
me by post. so that I am trouble  
you too much I should like to see  
its face again. If you choose to  
fill it with duplicates you may -  
but the truth is that I will come  
cheaper by the book post.

Yours S. Mammerey  
of each slide there is a duplicate  
- one is for you, if you care for such  
my many love A. Mammerey

Bowditch  
May 1859

My dear L  
although I have not yet  
drawn up a list of the species found by  
the U.S. Expl. Exped. I am in a position  
to send you back the specimens, and slides  
in case you have any opportunity of sending  
them to America <sup>future</sup> all that I have to  
say may go any day in a letter -  
Now as to the specimens, you will see  
that I have put no to them - One is  
S. 725 - all the others have a no. with  
the S. These numbers ~~are~~ are the no. of  
my preparations and consequently of the slides,  
one specimen is marked 691, 692, 693 - ~~over~~  
by because I found it necessary to prepare  
slides of it in three different ways - 691  
showing the diatoms in situ - 692 the same  
detached from the wood but not boiled in acid -  
the 693 exhibits the slightly boiled in acid, and

consequently with some Lide views  
at Valer.

To save your head I kept a little  
of the S. 725, from Simsbury, Ct., on  
the paper. The second looking contained  
the same as the first, but vastly more  
dirty. The slides are from the first only  
~~from~~ the remaining specimens, I have  
but added a bit of each, as far as possible  
in this one piece of paper - for your  
herbarium (with me): These are not sent.  
So that all I have sent may be returned  
to America whenever you choose.

Besides these with No. are some  
with letters A, B, C, D, E, F. of these I  
made no preparations - of A because  
that was unnecessary, of the others because  
they were small in quantity and not worth  
"powder and shot" not worth the acid, as far  
as I can judge from a slight examination.  
one I fear, but whether I will or not -  
(E)

It is markedly your Polypodium,  
Monoecium (? I really cannot make out the  
name): There is a Platygaster adhering  
to it, but I have only <sup>by chance</sup> seen one or two  
more, and unless I saw more cannot undertake  
to say what it is. I had to cut off one or  
two of the branches to enable me to determine  
there were any distinct ones at all.

691, 692, 693 is marked Arctic seeds?  
now really distinct and no value unless  
we know the locality nearly.

Another, 699 is dated 10.8.55 (at  
least I suppose it is the date) - but no  
station is given.

Can you give me any information  
as to these two -

I intend arranging my notes by the  
localities and specimens - but this is  
impossible unless I know better  
from whom the specimens come.